REMARKS

The Office Action of August 8, 2003 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-10 and 12-22 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-10 and 12-22 are rejected.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1,6-10,16, 17, 19, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,122,372 to Hughes.

Claim 1 includes the feature of "creating an object from the data file with a plugin object corresponding to the predetermined schema." The use of plugins is described, for example, on page 12, lines 7-12 of the present application. As described in the present application:

> For example, a first plugin may extract the information contained in the data file shown in figure 6 and rehydrate the information into an object recognized by the first operating system. Furthermore, a second plugin may be used to extract and rehydrate the same information into an object recognized by a second operating system.

The Office Action alleges that this feature is found in column 9, lines 25-32 of Hughes. The cited section of Hughes states:

> Next, encapsulated message 200 includes a template tag 204 that provides a template CNS ID, a protocol tag 205 that provides a protocol CNS ID, and a contract tag 206 provides a contract CNS ID. The purpose of the template, protocol, and contract CNS ID's is to verifiably identify the template, protocol, and contract which should be used to interpret the encapsulated message. An example of a template is shown below:

The cited section of Hughes merely describes using template, protocol and contract tags to **interpret** the message. There is no teaching or suggestion for creating anything. And, in addition, there is no

teaching or suggestion for "creating an object from the data file with a plugin object corresponding to the predetermined schema."

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1. Each of claims 6-10 ultimately depends from claim 1 and is allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 16 includes the feature of "identifying a plugin object that creates an object from the data file" and claim 20 includes the feature of "creating an object from the data file with a plugin object corresponding to the predetermined schema." Claims 16 and 20 are believed to be allowed for reasons similar to those provided above. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 16 and 20. Claims 17 and 19 depend from claim 16 and claim 22 depends from claim 20. Dependent claims 17, 19 and 22 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

Claims 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,446,110 to Lection et al.

Claim 12 includes the feature of "a data field containing manifest information corresponding to the information contained in the data file data field." The present specification describes "manifest information," for example, on page 10, lines 10-20. Manifest information is also illustrated in figure 5 of the application. As described in the application, manifest information may include the name of a document, description of a document, name of attachments, description of attachments and identification of the type of attachment.

In response to previous arguments provided by the Applicant, the Office Action now alleges that this feature is found in column 9, lines 22-30 of Lection et al. The Office Action alleges that the cited section of Lection et al. "is considered to be a description of the document." The Applicant

7

respectfully disagrees. In column 9, lines 22-30, Lection et al. merely describes using tags to partition an actual host screen image. In particular, the content, interaction and display elements specify the actual image, as opposed to "containing manifest information corresponding to the information contained in the data file data field." See column 9, lines 28-58 and Figures 13A-13C.

The Office Action alleges that Lection et al. discloses "a data field containing a data file formatted in a markup language in accordance with the schema" in column 9, lines 7-9. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion also. The cited section merely describes a data type definition (DTD), which is a grammar that describes what tags and attributes are valid in an XML document or data stream. The data type definition is used to format the information described in the rest of column 9. Lection et al. never teaches or suggests including **both** "a data field containing a data file" and "a data field containing manifest information," as required by claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 12. Each of claims 13-15 ultimately depends from claim 12 and is allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claims 5, 18 and 21 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of Lection et al.

Claims 5, 18 and 21 are dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,856 to Chen et al.

Each of claims 2-4 ultimately depends from claim 1 and is allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner believe that a conversation with Applicant's representative would be useful in the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to call Applicant's representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 7, 2003

Charles L. Miller
Registration No. 43,805

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 463-5000
Facsimile: (312) 463-5001